

REMARKS

The Specification has been amended to conform to current US guidelines, claims 1 and 2 have been amended to correct informalities, and claims 5-7 has been added to further define the invention. Accordingly, claims 1-7 are pending with claims 3 and 4 having been withdrawn from consideration.

Applicants respectfully assert that support for amended claim 1 and new claims 5-7 may be found, for example, in FIGs. 1-5, as well as corresponding pages of the Specification. In addition, Applicants respectfully assert that new claim 5 is commensurate the elected Group I invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that amended claim 1 and new claim 5 do not introduce new matter.

Objections to the Specification

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Abstract of the Invention is objected to for allegedly not sufficiently describing the invention. Accordingly, Applicants have amended the Abstract in accordance with the Examiner's suggestions. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the objection to the Abstract be withdrawn.

On pages 2 to 3 of the Office Action, Applicants are reminded of the guidelines for the preferred layout of the Specification. Accordingly, Applicants have amended the Specification to include specific headings related to the

guidelines. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the objection to the Specification be withdrawn.

Claim Objections

On page 3 of the Office Action, claims 1 and 2 are objected to because of informalities. Accordingly, Applicants have amended claims 1 and 2 in accordance with the Examiner's suggestions. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the objections to claims 1 and 2 be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112

On page 4 of the Office Action, claims 1 and 2 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. Specifically, various terminology and phrases are allegedly vague and indefinite. Accordingly, Applicants have amended claims 1 and 2 in accordance with the Examiner's comments. Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 1 and 2 comply with the requirements under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, and respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

On pages 5 to 6 of the Office Action, claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by De Puy (US 3,466,743) and claims 1 and 2 stands rejected under

35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Davis (US 3,656,378). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Independent claim 1, as amended, recites a method for producing a winding for an electrical transformer from a cylindrical tubular metal element including steps of “machining, in a first series of passes, a first series of cuts substantially parallel to one another through all of the sides of the tubular element *with the exception of a last one of said sides,*” and “machining, in a second series of passes, a second series of cuts *in said last one of said sides* in order to ensure that junctions of the first series of cuts open out in the sides adjacent to the second series of cuts, so that the first and second series of cuts are continuous with respect to one another and constitute a single groove of helicoidal shape,” emphasis added.

In direct contrast to Applicants’ claimed invention, De Puy merely discloses simultaneously performing parallel rectilinear cuts 4 through a single side and partially along two adjacent sides to corresponding apertures 2 using a band saw blade 4a. Then, De Puy discloses making final parallel rectilinear cuts 4 through another opposing single side and further partially along the two adjacent sides to the apertures 2. In addition, De Puy requires the formation of the apertures 2 prior to performing the parallel rectilinear cuts 4, whereby the parallel rectilinear cuts 4 alone are insufficient to form a

single groove of helicoidal shape. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that De Puy fails to teach or suggest machining, in first and second series of passes, first and second series of cuts, as required by independent claim 1. Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that De Puy fails to anticipate the combination of features recited by at least independent claim 1, and respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

In further direct contrast to Applicants' claimed invention, Davis merely discloses successively cutting each of four walls of a rectangular member. Here, Davis explicitly requires cutting each of the four walls individually. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that Davis fails to teach or suggest "a first series of cuts substantially parallel to one another through all of the sides of the tubular element with the exception of a last one of said sides," as required by independent claim 1. Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that Davis fails to anticipate the combination of features recited by at least independent claim 1, and respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

New Claims

Applicants respectfully assert that new claims 5-7 are allowable over the applied prior art for at least their ultimate dependence upon independent claim 1, as well as the combination of features that new claims 5-7 recite. Accordingly, Applicants

respectfully request that new claims 5-7 be indicated as being allowable, as well as claims 1 and 2.

Conclusion

This Response is believed to be fully responsive and to place the application in condition for allowance. Entry of the Amendment, and an early and favorable action on the merits is earnestly requested. Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this application.

Should the Examiner believe that any matters need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 25-0120 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17.

Respectfully submitted,

YOUNG & THOMPSON

/ David B. Hardy /

David B. Hardy, Reg. No. 47,362
209 Madison Street
Suite 500
Alexandria, VA 22314
Telephone (703) 521-2297
Telefax (703) 685-0573
(703) 979-4709

DBH/hc

APPENDIX:

The Appendix includes the following item(s):

- ☒ - a new Abstract of the Disclosure